For the Northern District of California

26

27

28

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
7	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
9	Plaintiff, No. C 02-04948 JSW (EDL)
10	V. (LDL)
11	, ,
12	ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO COMPEL
13	TO COM EL
14	REAL PROPERTY AT 6557 ASCOT DRIVE, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA,
15	Defendant.
16	STEVE FONTAINE and NILOUFER
17	FONTAINE,
18	Claimants.
19	In this civil forfeiture action, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel seeking: (1) further production
20	of documents from Claimants Steven and Nikoufer Fontaine; (2) the continued deposition of Steven
21	Fontaine; and (3) the deposition of Christopher Stenning in London. Claimant Steven Fontaine filed
22	a nonopposition to Plaintiff's motion. Claimant Niloufer Fontaine did not file any response to Plaintiff's
23	motion. Because this matter is appropriate for decision without oral argument, the Court vacated the
24	December 9, 2008 hearing on Plaintiff's motion.
25	December 7, 2000 hearing on Frankin 8 motion.

The documents sought by Plaintiff are relevant to this matter, and Claimants do not oppose their production. Therefore, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel production of documents is granted. In addition, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel further deposition of Steven Fontaine based on the further production of documents is granted.

Plaintiff contends that the Stenning deposition is necessary based on a document produced by Steven Fontaine during his July 24, 2008 deposition. The Court is troubled that Plaintiff is only seeking this deposition after the close of discovery even though Plaintiff has known since July 24, 2008 of Mr. Stenning's involvement in this case. However, the Court gives Plaintiff leave to make arrangements to take Mr. Stenning's deposition in London, England on the condition that doing so does not change Judge White's pretrial and trial schedule for this case. By allowing this deposition, the Court is not extending any other deadlines previously set by Judge White. The Court notes that arranging depositions in foreign countries can be time-consuming, and in the end may be a futile exercise given the other deadlines in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 5, 2008

United States Magistrate Judge